REMARKS

The Office Action and prior art relied upon have been carefully considered. The changes to the specification suggested by the Examiner have been made along with the appropriate changes to the claims objected to by the Examiner. Accordingly, further objections to the specification and claims are not anticipated. Formal drawings accompany this amendment in response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Applicant notes the indicated allowability of claims 4-6 subject to their being rewritten in independent form. This has been done with the rewriting of claim 4 in independent form, claims 5-6 being dependent thereon. Thus, claims 4-6 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2 , 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35USC 103(a) as being obvious over Kawai et al. (U.S.P. 5,479,203) in view of Conway (U.S.P. 5,719,622). In order to expedite the prosecution, claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 have been cancelled.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35USC 103(a) as being obvious over Kawai et al. (U.S.P. 5,479,203) in view of Conway (U.S.P. 5,719,622) further in view of Arita et al. (U.S.P. 5,432,530). To make clear the difference between the present invention and the prior art, claim 3 has been amended by incorporating the features of original claim 1 and further by a feature that the value of the pivoting speed command signal assumes a maximum value when the operation angle of the joystick mechanism is greater than another reference operation angle which is greater than the first-mentioned reference operation angle. The above added feature is supported by the graphical representation of Fig. 5. The way of controlling the pivoting angle speed in accordance with the operation angle of said joystick mechanism along the curve shown in the graphical representation of Fig. 5 is unique and is not obvious from the disclosure of any cited references. More specifically, although the Examiner contends that Arita et al. discloses a pointing device method control in which in the joystick, speed control is performed so that the speed of the movement of the cursor changes in accordance with the slant of the lever 1021, this does not suggest the control according to the unique curve of Fig. 5.

In addition to the amendment of claim 3, new claim 10 has been added so as to cover a manner of control in which a value of the pivoting speed command signal assumes a maximum value when the operation angle of the joystick mechanism is greater than a reference operation angle and is smaller than a maximum operation angle of the joystick mechanism as shown in Fig. 5. .

It is believed that the manner of control now defined respectively by amended claim 3 and new claim 10 are not obvious from the combination of the disclosure of the cited references.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 20402-00584-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Morris Liss
Registration No.: 24,510
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments